

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 2-5 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Japanese Patent Application 08-314389 to Sugimura et al. (hereinafter "Sugimura") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,002,582 to Yeager et al. (hereinafter "Yeager"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the reasons as set forth below.

Specifically, the Examiner alleges that Sugimura teaches all the elements of the claims except that it fails to teach a first spacer inserted between a back face of a display panel and an inner main-face of a panel-mounting case, and a second spacer provided between a lower inner side face of the panel-mounting case and a lower outer side face of the display panel. However, the Examiner alleges that the reference of Yeager teaches the use of spring fingers 46 on a back face of a display panel configured to receive an adapter 48 and LCD panel 40'. Thus, the Examiner alleges that the combination of the references renders the present invention obvious.

However, as seen in Fig. 2 of the present invention, first spacers 4 are placed near four corners of the panel-mounting case 1 and on an inner main-face of the panel-mounting case 1, and second spacers 5 are placed between a lower inner side face of the panel-mounting case 1 and a lower outer side face of the display panel 2, and as recited in independent claims 2 and 7. Accordingly, the first spacers 4 support a rear face of the display panel 2, and the second spacers 5 prevent the display panel 2 from *shifting along an up-and-down direction* when the display panel 2 is erected.

The second spacers 5 are placed between a lower inner *side* face of the panel-mounting case 1 and a lower outer *side* face of the display panel 2 when the open type display panel housing is erected; thus, the second spacers 5 function as a set of members fixing and placing the

display panel 2 preventing the display panel 2 from sliding along an up-and-down direction while the display panel housing is open.

Consequently, even if the display panels 2 are *different* from each other or of *various* kinds, and the panel-mounting case 1 and the display cover 6, respectively, of the display panel housing are of a common predetermined type, the display panels 2 can be mounted as one integral structure in the panel-mounting case 1 simply, and it is not necessary to change the panel-mounting case 1 and the display cover 6 of high cost by using various combinations of the first spacers 4, the second spacers 5 and the holding members 3.

Yeager fails to teach second spacers that are placed between a lower inner side face of the panel-mounting case and a lower outer side face of the display panel. The second spacers of the present invention prevent the display panel from sliding up and down in the housing. Yeager, in Fig. 3, only teaches spring fingers that hold an adapter on the *back face* of the adapter and hold the display panel on the *back face* of the display panel. It is possible in Yeager that the display panel will still shift in an up and down direction using the spring fingers.

Further, the spring fingers in Yeager only hold an adapter 48, which in turn holds the display panel 40'. Therefore, the housing 46 is only able to hold a certain adapter, which in turn holds the display panel. The use of the spacers in the present invention allows the housing to hold display panels of any size and of various kinds. The panel mounting case can thus hold a display panel of any size through the use of various size spacers, which are cheap and easy to manufacture and replace. The display panel can be of any thickness by use of the first spacers and of any height through the use of the second spacers. It does not need a third piece such as the adapter used in Yeager. Thus, the manufacturing costs are lessened, and the resulting price to the consumer is lessened. The reference of Yeager uses spring fingers that can only hold a certain type of adapter, which in turn can only hold certain display panels.

The present invention, through the use of spacers, does not need an adapter, and further, is able to hold various kinds and sizes of display panels. This advantage is not taught by the cited reference of Sugimura, individually or in combination with Yeager.

It has been held by the Courts that to establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). The cited references of Sugimura and Yeager fail to teach second spacers that are placed between a lower inner side face of the panel-mounting case and a lower outer side face of the display panel, as recited in independent claims 2 and 7. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 2-5 and 7-10 under Sugimura in view of Yeager, and respectfully requests allowance of claims 2-5 and 7-10.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorney would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Aasheesh V. Shravah  
Registration No. 54,445

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER  
400 Garden City Plaza - Ste. 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

AVS:jam